UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

| SEYED MOHSEN HOSSEINI-S | EDEHY,) | w , | | | | |
|--|--------------------|----------------|--------------|--------------------------------|--------|------|
| Plaintiff, |) (| | | 04 | | RGS |
| V. |) | | | | | • |
| ERIN T. WITHINGTON and CITY OF BOSTON, |) | Civil Action N | lo. REC | EIPT # | | |
| Defendants. | MAGISTRATE JUDGE_(| <u>iohen</u> | LOC, | DUNT \$_ IMONS I AL RULE | SSUE | D487 |
| COMPL | AINT AND JURY DEMA | AND | MCF BY DE | 'ER FOR ISSUED PTY. CLI | IM | 0 W |
| | <i>PARTIES</i> | | DATE | 011 | X TO C | |

- Seyed Mohsen Hosseini-Sedehy ("Plaintiff") is an individual, who resides at 106
 13th Street, Charlestown, Massachusetts.
- 2. Defendant Erin T. Withington, also known as, Erin T. Schroeder, is an individual, who resides at 25 Beaufield Street, Dorchester, Massachusetts. Defendant Withington is employed by the City of Boston as a police officer.
- 3. Defendant City of Boston ("Defendant City of Boston") is a city located in Suffolk County, Massachusetts.

JURISDICTION

4. The Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this controversy pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 because this civil action arises under the Constitution of the United States and 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

5. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391 (b) because both defendants reside in this judicial district and the events giving rise to this civil action occurred in this judicial district.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 6. The Plaintiff was born in Iran. He received a bachelors of science degree from the University of Iowa in 1984 and his masters degree in applied math from the University of Iowa in 1986.
- 7. The Plaintiff is married with a son. The Plaintiff became a United States citizen in 1992.
- 8. The Plaintiff has been employed by GES Exposition Services ("GES") since 1991. GES performs general contractor services for conventions and trade shows.
- 9. GES hired members from the local Teamsters union to perform labor for conventions and trade shows in Boston. Since 2002, the Plaintiff has supervised the Teamsters employed by GES in Boston.
- 10. In 2002, Joseph Bavis was a Teamster occasionally employed by GES. In late 2002, Bavis claimed a physical disability preventing him from working and collected disability payments from the Teamsters.
- 11. After Bavis exhausted his disability benefits from the Teamsters, he sought to return to work for GES. When GES refused to employ Bavis in July 2003, Bavis initiated a labor dispute against GES and the Teamsters. GES refused to employ Bavis until late February 2004.

Page 3 of 8

- 12. In retaliation for his labor dispute with GES, Bavis made a false report of sexual assault against the Plaintiff to Defendant Withington in her capacity as a Boston police officer.
- 13. Although Bavis did not work for GES at any time in 2003, Bavis told Defendant Withington the Plaintiff sexually assaulted him while Bavis was at work for GES in 2003. Bavis gave Defendant Withington contradicting dates in 2003 for the false sexual assault allegation.
- 14. Defendant Withington knew, should have known, or acted in reckless disregard of the fact that Bavis's allegations against the Plaintiff were false.
- 15. On March 22, 2004, Defendant Withington, in her capacity as a Boston police officer, provided information that she knew was false, should have known was false, or presented in reckless disregard of the truth to a clerk magistrate at the Boston Municipal Court in an effort to obtain a criminal complaint against the Plaintiff and an arrest warrant for the Plaintiff.
- 16. Based upon the false information provided by Defendant Withington, the clerk magistrate of the Boston Municipal Court granted Defendant Withington's request for a criminal complaint against the Plaintiff and an arrest warrant for the Plaintiff.
- 17. On March 22, 2004, Defendant Withington, in her capacity as a Boston police officer, falsely arrested and detained the Plaintiff while the Plaintiff was at work for GES at the Hynes Convention Center.
- 18. On June 14, 2004 the Suffolk County District Attorney filed a nolle prosequi with respect to Defendant Withington's criminal complaint against the Plaintiff.

19. As a result of Defendant Withington's false arrest and the detention of the Plaintiff, the Plaintiff has suffered damages.

COUNT I

Defendant Withington's Violation of the Plaintiff's Civil Rights

- 20. The Plaintiff repeats his allegations and incorporates herein by reference paragraphs 1-19.
- 21. The Plaintiff had a right to be free from an unreasonable seizure protected by the United States Constitution.
- 22. On March 22, 2004, the Plaintiff was deprived of his right to be free from an unreasonable seizure.
- 23. The Plaintiff was deprived of his right to be free from an unreasonable seizure by the reckless or intentional conduct of Defendant Withington acting under the color of law.
- 24. As a result of Defendant Withington's actions depriving him of his right to be free from an unreasonable seizure, the Plaintiff has suffered damages.

COUNT II

Defendant City of Boston's Violation of the Plaintiff's Civil Rights for Failure to Train Defendant Withington Properly

- 25. The Plaintiff repeats his allegations and incorporates herein by reference paragraphs 1-24.
- 26. Defendant City of Boston failed to train properly Defendant Withington as a police officer employed by Defendant City of Boston.

- 27. Defendant City of Boston's failure to train properly Defendant Withington as a police officer was the product of Defendant City of Boston's deliberate indifference to the federal constitutional rights of its citizens.
- 28. Defendant City of Boston's failure to train properly Defendant Withington as a police officer was Defendant City of Boston's policy or custom.
- 29. Defendant City of Boston's failure to train properly Defendant Withington as a police officer caused the Plaintiff's damages.

COUNT III

Defendant City of Boston's Violation of the Plaintiff's Civil Rights for Failure to Supervise Defendant Withington Properly

- 30. The Plaintiff repeats his allegations and incorporates herein by reference paragraphs 1-29.
- 31. Defendant City of Boston failed to supervise properly Defendant Withington as a police officer employed by Defendant City of Boston.
- 32. Defendant City of Boston's failure to supervise properly Defendant Withington as a police officer was the product of Defendant City of Boston's deliberate indifference to the federal constitutional rights of its citizens.
- 33. Defendant City of Boston's failure to supervise properly Defendant Withington as a police officer was Defendant City of Boston's policy or custom.
- 34. Defendant City of Boston's failure to supervise properly Defendant Withington as a police officer caused the Plaintiff's damages.

REQUEST FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff requests that the court:

- a) Enter judgment against Defendant Withington on all counts of this Complaint;
- b) Enter judgment against Defendant City of Boston on all counts of this Complaint;
- c) Award the Plaintiff his actual damages caused by Defendant Withington;
- d) Award the Plaintiff his actual damages caused by Defendant City of Boston;
- e) Award the Plaintiff all appropriate costs, expenses, attorneys' fees and interest authorized by law; and
- f) Award the Plaintiff such other relief deemed just and appropriate.

JURY TRIAL DEMAND

The Plaintiff demands a trial by jury on all issues so triable.

Respectfully submitted, Seyed Mohsen Hosseini-Sedehy By his attorneys,

Christopher A. Duggan

BBO # 544150

Gerard A. Butler, Jr.

BBO # 557176

Smith & Duggan LLP

Lincoln North

55 Old Bedford Road

Lincoln, MA 01773-1125

(617) 228-4400

Date: September 2, 2004

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

| | i case (nami | e of first party on each side only) | Seyed Mohsen Hoss | seini-sedeny v. | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|-----|--|--|--|
| | · | | Erin T. Withingto | Erin T. Withington and City of Boston | | | | |
| Categ | ory in which | the case belongs based upon the n | umbered nature of suit code lis | ted on the civil cover sheet. (See | | | | |
| local r | ule 40.1(a)(1 |)). | | | | | | |
| _ | l. | 160, 410, 470, R.23, REGARDLESS | OF NATURE OF SUIT. | | | | | |
| <u>X</u> | II. | 195, 368, 400, 440, 441-444, 540, 5740, 790, 791, 820*, 830*, 840*, 85 | | *Also complete AO 120 or AO 121 for patent, trademark or copyright ca | ses | | | |
| | 111. | 110, 120, 130, 140, 151, 190, 210, 315, 320, 330, 340, 345, 350, 355, 380, 385, 450, 891. | 360, 362, 365, 370, 371, | | | | | |
| | IV. | 220, 422, 423, 430, 460, 510, 530, 690, 810, 861-865, 870, 871, 875, | 900. 0 4 1 650, 660, | 1948 RGS | | | | |
| | V. | 150, 152, 153. | | | | | | |
| | | e indicate the title and number of the | | <u> </u> | | | | |
| Has a | prior action | n between the same parties and base | ed on the same claim ever been | filed in this court? | | | | |
| D | Ab1-i | the annual matter the appoint | YES | (NO) | | | | |
| | tne compiaii SC §2403) | nt in this case question the constitut | lonality of an act of congress at | necting the public interest: (See | | | | |
| lf so, | is the U.S.A. | or an officer, agent or employee of t | YES the U.S. a party? | NO | | | | |
| | | | YES | NO | | | | |
| is this | s case requi | red to be heard and determined by a | district court of three judges p | ursuant to title 28 USC §2284? | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | YES | (NO) | | | | |
| | achusetts (" | es in this action, excluding governm governmental agencies"), residing | nental agencies of the united sta | ates and the Commonwealth of | | | | |
| Massa | achusetts (" J)). | governmental agencies"), residing | nental agencies of the united sta In Massachusetts reside in the YES | ates and the Commonwealth of same division? - (See Local Rule | | | | |
| Massa | achusetts (" | If yes, in which division do all of t | nental agencies of the united sta in Massachusetts reside in the YES the non-governmental parties re | ates and the Commonwealth of same division? - (See Local Rule NO eside? | | | | |
| Massa | achusetts (" J)). | governmental agencies"), residing | nental agencies of the united sta In Massachusetts reside in the YES | ates and the Commonwealth of same division? - (See Local Rule | | | | |
| Massa | achusetts (" J)). | If yes, in which division do all of t | nental agencies of the united state in Massachusetts reside in the YES the non-governmental parties reCentral Division | ates and the Commonwealth of same division? - (See Local Rule NO eside? Western Division | | | | |
| Massa | achusetts (" J)). A. | If yes, in which division do all of the Eastern Division If no, in which division do the majority | nental agencies of the united state in Massachusetts reside in the YES the non-governmental parties reCentral Division | ates and the Commonwealth of same division? - (See Local Rule NO eside? Western Division | | | | |
| Massa 40.1(d | achusetts (" i)). A. B. | If yes, in which division do <u>all</u> of the Eastern Division If no, in which division do the maje agencies, residing in Massachus | nental agencies of the united state in Massachusetts reside in the YES the non-governmental parties recentral Division fority of the plaintiffs or the only setts reside? | ates and the Commonwealth of same division? - (See Local Rule NO eside? Western Division parties, excluding governmental Western Division | | | | |
| Massa 40.1(d | achusetts (" i)). A. B. g a Notice o | If yes, in which division do all of the Eastern Division If no, in which division do the majagencies, residing in Massachus Eastern Division f Removal - are there any motions per arate sheet identifying the motions) | nental agencies of the united state in Massachusetts reside in the YES the non-governmental parties recentral Division fority of the plaintiffs or the only setts reside? | ates and the Commonwealth of same division? - (See Local Rule NO eside? Western Division parties, excluding governmental Western Division | | | | |
| Massi 40.1(d If filin yes, s SE TYPI | achusetts ("d)). A. B. g a Notice of Submit a sep | If yes, in which division do all of the Eastern Division If no, in which division do the maje agencies, residing in Massachus Eastern Division f Removal - are there any motions per arate sheet identifying the motions) | nental agencies of the united state in Massachusetts reside in the YES the non-governmental parties recentral Division for the plaintiffs or the only setts reside? Central Division ending in the state court requiring the stat | ates and the Commonwealth of same division? - (See Local Rule NO eside? Western Division parties, excluding governmental Western Division ng the attention of this Court? (If | | | | |
| Massi 40.1(d If filin yes, s SE TYPI | achusetts (" i)). A. B. g a Notice o | If yes, in which division do all of the Eastern Division If no, in which division do the maje agencies, residing in Massachus Eastern Division If Removal - are there any motions per arate sheet identifying the motions) Christopher A. Duggar | nental agencies of the united state in Massachusetts reside in the YES the non-governmental parties recentral Division for the plaintiffs or the only setts reside? Central Division ending in the state court requiring the stat | ates and the Commonwealth of same division? - (See Local Rule NO eside? Western Division parties, excluding governmental Western Division ng the attention of this Court? (If | | | | |

Case 1:04-cv-11948-RGS Document 1 Filed 09/07/2004 CIVIL COVER SHEET Page 8 of 8

JS 44 (Rev. 3/99)

The JS-44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

| I. (a) PLAINTIFFS | | | | DEFENDANTS | | | | |
|---|--|---|-----------------|---|---|--|--|--|
| Seyed Mohsen Ho | sseini-Sedehy | | | | . Withington E Boston | | | |
| (b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Suffolk | | | | County of Residen | County of Residence of First Listed Suffoli | | | |
| | CEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF | CASES) | | | (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASE: D CONDEMNATION CASES, US INVOLVED. | | | |
| (c) Attorney's (Firm Nam Christopher A. Smith & Duggan | Duggan | Number) | | Attorneys (If Kno | own) | | | |
| Lincoln North, | 55 Old Bedford | | n | | | | | |
| Lincoln, MA 017 II. BASIS OF JURISD | ·-· | 617-228-4400 in One Box Only) | | ZENSHIP OF P | RINCIPAL PARTIES | Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff | | |
| in brisis strockes | (,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,, | ,, | 1 | iversity Cases Only) | | and One Box for Defendant) DEF | | |
| ☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff | Federal Question (U.S. Govern n | Citizer | n of This State | DEF 1 | Principal Place 🔲 4 🔲 4 | | | |
| ☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant | t | | Citizer | n of Another State 🛚 | • | / Principal Place 5 5 5 Another State | | |
| W. NATURE OF CHE | | N D O.I.o. | I . | n or Subject of a □ eign Country | 3 | □ 6 □ 6 | | |
| IV. NATURE OF SUIT | | RTS | FORF | EITURE/PENALTY | BANKRUPTCY | OTHER STATUTES | | |
| 110 Insurance 120 Marine 130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of 150 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excl. Veterins) 153 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excl. Veterins) 160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability REAL PROPERTY 210 Land Condemnation 220 Force losure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property | Slander 330 Federal Employers' Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability 350 M otor V chicle 355 M otor V chicle Product Liability 360 Other Personal Injury CIVIL RIGHTS 441 Voting 442 Employment 443 Housing/ Accommodations 444 Welfare 440 Other Civil Rights | PRISONER PETIT 510 Motions to Vace Sentence Habeas Corpus: 530 General 535 De ath Penalty 540 Mandamus & O 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition | 62 | 0 Agriculture 0 Other Food & Drug 5 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 0 Liquor Laws 0 R.R. & Truck 0 Airline Regs. 0 Occupational Safety/Health 0 Other LABOR 0 Fair Labor Sundards Act 10 Labor'M gmt. Relations 0 Labor'M gmt. Reporting & Disclosure Act 10 Railway Labor Act 10 Other Labor Litigation 11 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act | 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 PROPERTY RIGHTS 820 Copyrights 830 Patent 840 Trad emark 840 Trad emark 840 Trad emark 861 H IA (13.95ff) 862 Black Lung (923) 863 DIW CDIW W (405 (g)) 864 SSID Tile XVI 865 RS1 (405(g)) FEDERAL TAXSUITS 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) 871 IRS — Third Party 26 USC 7609 | 400 State Reap portionment 410 Antitust 430 Banks and Banking 450 Commerce TCC Rates/etc. 460 Deportation 470 Racke teer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations 810 Selective Service 850 Securities/Commodities/Exchange 875 Customer Challenge 12 USC 3410 891 Agricultural Acts 892 Economic Stabilization Act 893 Environmental Matters 894 Energy Allocation Act 895 Freedom of Information Act 900 Appeal of Fee Determination Act 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes 890 Other Statutory Actions | | |
| V. ORIGIN To 1 Original 2 R | tate Court / | Remanded from Appellate Court | Reope | another another another ated or 5 (specified) | erred from rr district y) □ 6 Multidistr Litigation | | | |
| VI. CAUSE OF ACTI 42 U.S.C. \$198 from an unreaso VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: VIII. RELATED CAS IF ANY | 3 The Plaintif nable seizure UNDER F.R.C. (See | S IS A CLASS ACTION P. 23 | y.) Ly arres | | CHECK YES only JURY DEMAND: DOCKET NUMBER | if demanded in complaint: | | |
| September 2, 2 FOR OFFICE USE ONLY RECEIPT # | 004 | SIGNAPORE OF A | TTORNEY OF | RECORD LUDGE | MAG. JUI | VCI: | | |